Chapter 3
The Ottoman, Safavid and Mughal Empires
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3.1 **THE OTTOMAN, SAFAVID, AND MUGHAL EMPIRES:**

In 857/1453 a clan of Turkish warriors or ghazis conquered Constantinople, ended eleven centuries of Byzantine rule, and completed the job. The Arabs had left unfinished in the Seventh Century. The conquest of Constantinople (henceforth Istanbul) opened the door for the expansion of Islamic rule into Southern Europe. It also brought enormous prestige to the conquerors, the clan of Osman (Arabic: ‘uthman), who achieved what other Muslims had tried and failed at for eight centuries. Their leader, Muhammad, earned the title “Conqueror”, and the power of the Osmanli family rapidly grew. Muhammad’s successors consolidated Osmanli rule in Anatolia and extended it into the Balkans. In 923/1517 Selim “The Inexorable” (or “the Grim” depending on which side yo were on) defeated the Egyptian Mamluks in Syria. Suddenly, the Ottomans, as Europeans called the family of Osman, had obtained for themselves an empire that was astonishingly similar in size and extent to the Pre-Islamic Byzantine empire. At the height of Ottoman power under Sulayman “The Lawgiver”, who reigned for forty-six years from 927/1520 to 974/1566, the empire encircled the Black and red seas, and encompassed three quarters of the Mediterranean coast. The Ottomans ruled over vast numbers of non-Muslim subjects, and the Turkish armies were the terror of Europe. In 936/1529 Sulayman’s forces laid siege to Vienna and would certainly have taken it had their troops not been so eager to get home before winter.

While the Ottomans were expanding into Europe, a rival Muslim empire was growing in Persia. In 907/1501 the leader of a radical shi‘i
Sufi order conquered Tabriz, set himself up as ruler, and pronounced Twelver Shi’ism the creed of the state. Isma’il thus became the founder of the safavid empire and the most successful and intolerant Shi’i ruler since the fall of the Fatimids. Isma’il seems to have aimed at no less than the complete destruction of Sunni Islam, and in the territory that came fully under his control he was astonishingly successful. He enforced the ritual cursing of the first three caliphs, Abu Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthman, as usurpers, disbanded Sunni tariqas and seized their assets, faced Sunni ‘ulama’ with the choice of conversion, death, or exile, and imported Shi’i scholars to replace them. The almost complete predominance of Twelver Shi’ism in modern Iran is largely Shah Isma’il’s doing.

Twelver Shi’ism might have come to dominate much more of the Islamic world in the newly emerging Ottoman state had not stood in Isma’il’s way. The Safavi Sufis had a significant following among the Turks of Anatolia, the so-called Qizil-bash (“Red Heads”) who had a penchant for red turbans. In 917/1511 The Qizil-bash rose in rebellion against the Ottomans, but three years later, in 920/1514, the Ottoman Sultan salim decisively defeated the safavids, ending Shi’i expansion. The Otomans response to the Safavid threat was to massacre the Qizil-bash and to persecute Shi’i Muslims more generally. The result was, for the first time, a sharp divide between Shi’i and Sunni Islam along geographical lines. The split deeply affected the ‘ulama; who were ghettoized. Consequently, Shi’i and Sunni intellectual culture moved in different directions. The division also had a profound effect on the development of popular piety. In Safavid lands the dominant religious form of Sunni Islam, tariqa Sufism, was replaced with popular Shi’i
piety, centered on the rememberance of the passion of Husayn at Karbala, and encouraging hatred of Sunnis.

To the east the final piece in the puzzle was put in place by Babur, an ambitious and resourceful descendant of Timur. Forced out of central Asia by Uzbek expansion, Babur based himself in Kabul and turned his attention to India. In 933/1526 he decisively defeated the Muslim rulers of Delhi at the battle of Panipat and the Mughal empire was born. During the long reign of Babur’s grandson Akbar (964-1014/1556-1605) Mughal power expanded to include most of the Indian subcontinent. Under Akbar the Mughals came close to a policy of religious neutrality, making Akbar the Poster child of later advocates of religious tolerance and a favorite of Indian historians. Akbar abolished the jizyah (head tax) on non-Muslims, prohibited Hindu girls from converting to Islam for marriage, set aside the death penalty for apostasy, and patronized the building of temples. He also engaged in religious experimentation, establishing a sort of private court tariqah of his own and giving a hearing to spokesmen of every tradition, including Christians. Akbar’s experiment with universalism did not last. His great grandson Aurangzeb, faced with a Hindu in Surrection in the South, restored the jizyah and generally adopted a hard line toward his Hindu subjects. Aurangzeb was the last of the great Mughal emperors. Soon after his reign Mughal power was on decline and very fast disintegrated.

3.1.1 THE OTTOMANS:

The word ‘Ottoman’ is the Europeanized form of Osman, the founder of the Turkish dynasty, so the Turkish tribesmen of Osman were
called ‘Osmanly’. They belong to the Kaayi clan of the Oghus Turks who had fled before the Mongol armies, and the name of Ottoman Turks is not entirely unfamiliar to the reader by now. In either ninth or tenth century, the Turks of central Asia were converted to Islam and in the eleventh century they began to push their way into south-Eastern Russia and Persia. In the almost continuous struggle, Turkish soldiers proved to be effective advanced gurds for Islam. The Turks who came into contact with Islam, accepted the Sunni faith and were fanatically loyal to its tenets and institutions. It is also said the Ottoman from-their ancestor Uthman (a namesake of the third ideal caliph).

The Ottoman state has emerged as the result of an Islamic movement under the leadership of Ghazi Osman (699-727/1299-1326) the founder of the Ottoman dynasty, towards the end of the 13th century at Eskisehir, located in north Western Anatolia. Early Ottoman rulers were fiefs of the Seljuqi monarchs whose capital was Konya. They derived their title of Sultan from the Abbasid Caliph in Cairo.
The Ottoman Sultanate:

Osman I  (699-727 / 1299-1326)
Orhan     (727-762/1326-1360)
Murad I   (762-702/1360-1389)
Bayezid Yilderim (702-805/1389-1402)

The Ottoman Empire:

1. Mehmed I (815-824/1412-1421)
2. Murad II (824-855/1421-1451)
3. Mehmed II (855-886/1451-1481)
4. Bayezid II (886-918/1481-1512)
5. Selim I (918-927/1512-1520)
6. Suleiman (927-974/1520-1566)
7. Selim II (974-982/1566-1574)
8. Murad III (982-1004/1574-1595)
9. Ahmad I (1004-1012/1595-1603)

The Ottoman was one of the largest and longest-lived dynasties the world has ever seen. Starting with uthman in direct male line, 36 Sultans ruled from 1300 to 1922. The Empire probably reached its zenith with Sulayman, the Magnificent, in the Sixteenth century. This was the greatest time of expansion. The North African conquests date from this period – all of North Africa, save Moraco, formed part of the empire. It
stretched from Budapest to Yemen, from Baghdad to Algeria. In 936/1529 Sulayman came close to taking Vienna.

The heart of the Ottoman Empire was the Topkapi place in Istanbul. The Topkapi was for hundred years the Seat of Ottoman power and is now advertised as ‘the largest and richest Museum in the world’.

3.1.2 Political development of the Ottoman:

The Ottoman state first appeared on the map of world history as a small Emirate which straddled the uneasy border between the seljukid and the Byzantine Empires in North Western Anatolia. It expanded rapidly and during the Period (702-805/1389-1402) achieved the status of a major imperial power, reaching as far as the Danube in the North and the Euphrates in the east. The first imperial experiment was brought to a sudden halt when the Ottomans, failing to use the strategic advantage gained by their defeat of a crusader army led by the Hungarian King Sigismund in 799/1396 at the battle of Nigbolu (Nicopolis), turned their military energies instead to the ill-timed annexation of Muslim emirates in Anatolia. In the ensuing melee, which was concluded by a major Ottoman defeat at the hands of Timur in 805/1402 at the battle or Ankara, the Ottomans’ Empire in Europe and Asia lost its cohesion. In the Subsequent period between 805/1402 and 816/1413, the empire was wrecked by inveterate civil war as rival claimants to the throne sought to rebuild the patrimonial hegemony. During the period of the civil war the scope of Ottoman sovereignty in Anatolia was severely restricted, and the centre of political power in the state shifted to the European province. It was during this period that
Edirne came into its own as the empire’s chief political capital. While the era of the civil war usually considered to be confined to the period of 805-16/1402-13, unstable political conditions persisted until 809/1425 – Threatening at times to restart the process of imperial disintegration. After 834/1430 when the Ottomans succeeded in capturing Salonica from the Venetians, the state entered into a renewed period of imperial expansion in Europe and they defeated a succession of crusader armies mobilized from the west. The Ottomans, by their victor, over the Polish-Hungarian King Ladislas at the battle of varna in 848/1444, firmly restored the empire’s dominance over the Balkan lands and brought the final fall of the Byzantine empire within the realm of possibility.

The Ottoman sovereign derived his imperial authority from three separate sources of legitimacy: from his adoption of the Islamic title Sultan, from the Turco-Mongol designation Khakan, and from the rank of Kaysar inherited from the rulers of the Eastern Roman Empire. Within the short span of sixty-four years after the fall of Constantinople the Ottoman had added the Arab Capitals of Damascus, Cairo, Mecca and Medinah to their imperial Patrimony and were catapulted into a position as the premier Islamic Power in the world.

3.1.3 Ottoman Knigs and their ranks:

The Ottoman Empire was primarily an army encampment. Fighting was a most important business. The Sultan accompanied the army and he took his pay as a Janissary, his name being first on the roll. The Ottomans were Sunni Muslims, and as such, their government was limited and restricted by Islamic law; it was not a theocracy, but could be termed as an autocracy in which the Sultan enjoyed very vast powers.
However, theocratic restrictions naturally limited the power of the Sultan. He had to share it with Shakykh ul-Islam, the highest religious dignitary in the land. The Ottoman Sultan tried to use their prerogatives as much as they could without doing away with the Shari‘ah. They certainly used titles: “Vicar of God on earth,” “Successor of the prophet”, “Pontiff of the Muslims”, “Refuge of the world”, “Shadow of God”, and, in unbecoming modesty, “Servant of the two sanctuaries”, (i.e. Mecca and Medina). Later, the Ottoman Turkish Sultan adopted the title of the Khalifah and declared their rule as Khilafat, successor to the Abbasid Khalifat which continued till 1343/1924.

3.1.4 The ‘Ulama’ and Ottoman rulers:

The Ottoman rulers succeeded in absorbing ‘Ulama’ (Scholars) into the structure of the state to an unprecedented degree. The Ottoman system was built upon the simple Mongol distinction between the rulers and the ruled. In this system the ‘Ulama’ formed their own hierarchy within the ruling class and were, in formal terms, part of the Ottoman army. Thus the title of two chief judges of the empire was Qadi-asker, Judge of the army. Above the Qadi-askers, the Shaykh al-Islam supervised a vast religious bureaucracy and shared equal status with the Grand Wazir. At the highest level, along with the Shaykh al-Islam and the Qadi-Askers, the household of the Sultan had two official prayer leaders, an official religious preceptor, a head strologer, and a head physician. Forty-three Qadi divided into three levels served under the Qadi-Askers. A variety of grades of Muftis, prayer leaders, and preachers filled up the secondary ranks of the ‘ulama’. The system was formally a meritocracy, and the ‘ulama’, were divided into twelve consecutive grades, with a formal system of certification marking the
passage from one grade to the next. The Ottomans, had successfully transformed the ‘ulama’ into a religious bureaucracy, tried, inextricably to the interests of the ruling class\(^2\).

What the Ottoman ‘Ulama’ lost by way of independence was more than compensated for in wealth, power and prestige. Like the other members of the ‘askeri class the ‘ulama’ paid no taxes, but they also enjoyed an additional unique privilege: they could pass on wealth to their descendants. Every other member of the army was, in formal terms, a slave of the ruling household and his property was subject to confiscation upon his death. Not so was the case of the religious scholars. Consequently, leading families worked hard to ensure that their sons entered the system. The ‘ulama’ also supervised and benefited from the income of vast religious endowments (awqaf, sing. Waqf). The Ottoman ‘ulama’ made good use of these privileges, amassing enormous wealth and power. At the higher echelons of the hierarchy those in power also contrived to keep the wealth and power in the family, so to speak and the most powerful ‘Ulama’ became, in effect a hereditary aristocracy\(^3\).

3.2 THE SAFAVID:

The safavd dynasty originated in the sufi order founded by safi al din (650-735/1252-1334) Shiaism was its faith and charter. The Turks, with Uzbegs on the eastern front, would be the constant enemies of the Safavid soldiers, the Qizilbash or red-heads. The Safavids wore red turbans with twelve folds commemorating the twelve Shiite Imams\(^4\).

In 907/1501 Shah Ismail I, was proclaimed ruler after defeating a Turkish army. The most important decision of the shah was to declare
that the official religion of the state would be Twelver-i thna ashari – Shiaism. The Saffavid state was to be a Theocracy, Shah Ismail Personified the Twelfth Imam in the flash. Shah Ismail conducted a vigorous campaign to convert the predominantly Sunni population to Shiaism. Then Shah Ismail’s Son, Shah Tahmasp, was an ascetic, and Tahmasp’s grandson, Shah Abbas the great (997-1039/1588-1629), coming to the throne when he was seventeen, brought saffavid fortunes to their peak. By 1015/1606, he had decisively defeated the Uzbegs and the Ottomans.

By the eighteenth century the Shia Ulama were beginning to challenge the theory of the divine right of kings, the concept that the Shah was the Imam incarnate, the Shadow of God, Zilallah, on earth. Mullah Ahmed Ardabili confronted Shah Abbas with the thesis that he did not rule by divine right but as a trust on behalf of the Imam. The ulama, he warned, would decide whether that trust was being honoured or not. Soon the Ulama were vigorously arguing that the Imam must be a genuine mujtahid, a man of learning and impeccable character. The ulama were bidding to take control of the Shia state which the safavid had created.

Henceforth, politics would oscillate between two points, secular rulers jealously guiding their authority while discovering their roots in imperial pre-Islamic Persian history and aggressive religious scholars claming a share of it. Where the rulers emphasized Persian language and custom especially drawing on the Pahlavis – Firdausi’s Shah Nama was a rich source- The ulama spoke of a universal Islam. I am an important sense the base for contemporary politics in Iran was being laid in the Safavid period itself.
A major development during the safavid reign was the end of the mutual toleration between Sunnis and Shias that existed from the time of the Mongols.

The developments in saffavid Persia would reverberate in society and politics up to the present times. Persia-Iran-became the largest, most powerful shia state in the world, the source and inspiration of shia dogma, the Champion of its destiny. The saffavid period thus determined, as it accurately reflected, the shape of things to be in what is now Iran\textsuperscript{18}.

What is very interesting about Safavids. It has been said, that Shah Abbas built a beautiful mausoleum over the tomb of the eight Imam Ali al-Rida in Mashhad and made a vow to walk from Isfahan on a pilgrimage at the completion of the edifice. He fulfilled his vow, and pilgrimage to Mashhad became about as important as the Pilgrimages to Mecca and to the tomb of Husayn at Karbala\textsuperscript{19}.

When Shah Abbas died in 1039/1629, there was no worthy successor left, for he had killed them all\textsuperscript{20}.
3.2.1 The Safavids of IRAN:

1. Esma'il I (906-931/1500-1524)
2. Tahmasb I (931-984/1524-1576)
3. Esma'il II (984-986/1576-1578)
4. Khodabandeh (986-996/1578-1587)
5. Abbas I (996-1039/1587-1629)
6. Safi (1039-1052/1629-1642)
7. Abbas II (1052-1078/1642-1667)
8. Soleiman (1078-1106/1667-1694)
9. Hossein (1106-1135/1694-1722)
10. Tahmasb II (1135-1144/1722-1731)
11. Abbas III (1144-1149/1731-1736)

3.2.2 Ulama and the Safavid Empire:

Ismail, Founder of the Safavid empire, had to recruit ‘ulama’ from outside of Iran in order to build his Shi‘i state. This should have proven a golden opportunity to exert state control over religious scholarship, but Shi‘i scholars were doctrinally well equipped to resist threats to their independence. To begin with they were disposed to reject the ultimate legitimacy of any state not led by the twelfth Imam. In addition, an internal squabble among Shi‘i ‘ulama’ ended up reinforcing the independence of scholars. Shi‘i scholars were divided into two camps over whether religious authority was primarily textual (the Akhbari position which paralleled the Sunnis) or whether it was vested in living scholars called mujtahids (the Usuli position). Under the Safavids the Usulis won out, and thought that each individual believer should submit to the authority of a particular living mujtahid. Twelver Shi‘i religious
authority thus reached directly to ordinary believers and bypassed the state. This independence was further encouraged by the rapid breakdown of state authority in Iran during the eighteenth century.

The most famous scholars of Safavid’s period Muhammad Majlisi became Sheikh al-Islam of Isfahan in 1099/1687 and Mullabashi- Head Mullah- in 1106/1694, the same year that Shah Sultan-Hosein started his reign. Although he would end his days as a drunken debauch Sultan-Hosein was initially pious, holding the Sheik in great respect. Majlisi was acknowledged as the foremost Shi’i scholar of his time. He wrote more than sixty books. He initiated a campaign against Sunnis and Sufis which opened with an effort at their expulsion from Isfahan. Although missings the lessons of tolerance and gentleness, Majlisi’s ideal was none the less the prophet: Bahar al-Anwar, accepted as his magnum opus, is an encyclopedic collection of hadith. Shi’i favour brought to and maintained at a pitch by the Safavids left little room for compromise or compassion; by the end its intensity had drained away the vitality of the state.

It seems that the Safavids’ support and recognized the ‘Ulama’, and they gave them the title of Sheik al-Islam and also ‘ulama’, recognized the Safavids as a “Shadow of God”. So they had not any challenge together and there were not any commandment each to other.
3.3 **Mughal Emperors of Hindustan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reign (AH / AD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Babar, Zahir-ad-din</td>
<td>(932 AH / 1525 AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Humayun, Nasir-ad-din</td>
<td>(937 / 1530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Akbar, Jalal-ad-din</td>
<td>(963 / 1556)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Jahangir, Nur-ad-din</td>
<td>(1014 / 1605)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Shah-Jahan, Shihab-ad-din</td>
<td>(1037 / 1628)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Aurangzeb, Muhyyi-ad-din</td>
<td>(1069 / 1659)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Bahadur Shah, Kutb-ad-din</td>
<td>(1119 / 1707)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Jahandar Shah, Mu’izz-ad-din</td>
<td>(1124 / 1712)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Farrukh-Siyar</td>
<td>(1124 / 1713)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Rafi-ad-darajat, Shams ad-din</td>
<td>(1131 / 1719)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Rafi-ad-daulah Shah Jahann II</td>
<td>(1131 / 1719)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Muhammad Nasir ad-din</td>
<td>(1131 / 1719)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Ahmad</td>
<td>(1161 / 1748)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Alamgir II, Aziz ad-din</td>
<td>(1167 / 1754)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Shah-Alam, Jalal ad-din</td>
<td>(1173 / 1759)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Muhammad Akbar II</td>
<td>(1221 / 1808)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Bahadur Shah II</td>
<td>(1253 / 1837)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those are the most famous of Maghal emperors and almost near non-famous of them are estimated to nine. And also this emperor, deposed by the British Government on 1275 AH / 1857 AD. 
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3.3.1 The Mughal:

The history of the Mughal Empire of Hindustan, which nominally extends from 932 / 1525 to 1276 / 1857, is rarely contained in much narrower limits. The assured domination of the Mughal Emperors begins with the building-up of the Empire by Akbar (963/1556–1014/1605) and practically ends with the death of Aurangzeb, the last autocrat of their line, in 1119/1707. Before Akbar there was no Mughal Empire, but only the attempt to create one.

In histories that focus on Akbar’s Ostentatious tolerance and pragmatic politics it is often forgotten that he stabilized the Mughal state only after decades of fighting. His most important conquests were those of the Rajput states in the Rajasthan desert west of Agra, for these Hindu warrior clans commanded the best armies in northern India. Mughal generals erected towers of skulls-Timurid terror tactics-from thousands of slain Rajput troops who resisted Akbar’s early campaigns.

Akbar’s Rajput relations astutely recognized political reality in an empire in which 80 to 90 per cent of the population was non-Muslim—predominantly Hindu but also Jain, animist, Christian, Jewish and Zoroastrian. The Mughals were a Turco-Mongol garrison state that controlled the urban centres and reform and revival.

Akbar, the Great Mughal, creating a new creed, the Din-i-ilahi; Ali transformed into an avatar with four arms; Duldul, the prophet’s mule, equated to Hanuman, the monkey god.
3.3.2 **The Mughal Connection in Pakistan:**

Drawing genealogical lines – so to speak from Aurangzeb and Dara Shikoh to the leaders of Pakistan illuminates the problem further for us. Mr. Z.A. Bhutto, a Prime Minister of Pakistan, in a significant and historical manner—and despite Berkely and oxford—reflects the conceptual position of Dara Shikoh. Both were eclectic and syncretist. While Dara Shikoh wished to include Hinduism in Islam, Bhutto attempted a similar exercise with the dominant rival ideology of his time, socialism, evolving the concept of ‘Islamic socialism’28.

3.3.3 **Mughal Kings and their powers:**

To whatever extent the Mughals dabbled in religious adventurism they saw themselves, and were largely seen, at least formally, as Champions of Islam Akbar the greatest Mughal Emperor, adopted the title of Jalaluddin, while Jahangir’s title was Nur al-din, light of religion, Shah Jahan’s Shihab al-din, bright star of religion, and Aurangzeb’s Muhyi al-din, life giver of religion. Akbar’s friend and publicist, Abul Fazal, went one step further. The Emperor Akbar was the Summation of the major spiritual and religious tendencies of the Islamic world. He was perfect man. For contemporary historians and scholars. The Mughals are ideal Muslim rulers. A blind eye is turned discreetly to imperial excesses. In fact they were autocrats and despotic ruler like their Ottomans and Safavid rulers. In certain respects, they may be different from each other but in their political philosophy and practice they all were autocrate Emperor.
3.3.4 The Mughal Rulers and ‘Ulama’:

The Mughal rulers also did their best to corral the ‘ulama’ into serving state interests, but with only partial success. Akbar tried to overrule the ‘ulama’ in the articulation and application of law, belatedly applying Ibn-al-Muqaffa’s advice by putting himself in the place of the final arbiter in the interpretation of Shari‘a. ‘A-Awrangzeb compiled his own collection of judicial rulings, the Fatawa-Yi’Alamgiri, in a similar attempt to make an end run around ‘ulama’ monopoly on interpretation of the law. It is clear that ‘ulama’ were closely involved with the state, but some of that involvement was by way of independent critique of state policy, as in the case of Ahmad Sirhindi, who ended up in prison for his pains. As with the Safavids, the rapid decline of Mughal power in the eighteenth century left the ‘ulama’ to fend for themselves, and they thus entered the modern period with their own institutions and accustomed to independence. It was an independence that would go in two different directions, however. Two quite different kinds of religious institutions emerged. The first represented by Lucknow’s Farangi Mahall, concentrated itself with the preservation of traditional learning in the midst of a tumultuous environment. A second line of ‘ulama’, represent by Shah Wali Allah and his descendants, actively worked for the reform of Islam and the restoration of Muslim Power.

It is no accident that the early eighteenth century produced one of the greatest Muslim scholars and reformers in India, Shah Wali Allah Dehlavi, who sounded the orthodox alarm as a result of a social condition of the Muslims. Contemporaneous to the Wahhabis in Arabia. He emphasized a reversion to pristine Islam. Rejection of Hindu
accretions, such as tomb worship, consulting Brahmins for omens and
celebrating Hindu festival, was advocated by him. Pointedly, he wrote
his major contribution to theological dialectics, Hujjat Allah al-baligha,
in Arabic not Persian. In spite of bitter polemics by the traditional
‘ulama’ he translated the Holy Quran into Persian in order that it should
reach a wider readership; his sons translated it into Urdu. Shah Wali
Allah’s ideas were to shape the Islamic college at Deoband and
influence Muslim of all opinions. Significantly, and logically, one of his
heroes was the Mughal emperor Aurangzeb.
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